

APPENDIX E

**SAMPLE PROPOSAL EVALUATION GUIDELINES,
PROPOSAL EVALUATION PLANS AND WORKSHEETS**

THE FOLLOWING ARE SAMPLE PROVISIONS FOR VARIOUS BEST VALUE SOURCE SELECTION METHODOLOGIES. YOU SHOULD STRUCTURE PROVISIONS TO FIT THE REQUIREMENTS OF YOUR PROCUREMENT.

SAMPLE: COST EVALUATION PLAN, DACA78-96-R-XXXX

1. Cost Evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the RFP, following a determination minimum requirements have been met (see Minimum Requirements Checklist).
2. The cost evaluation shall utilize the following cost evaluation criteria:
 - a. Overall Reasonableness.
 - b. Realism.
 - c. Completeness.
 - d. Performance Risk. Evaluation of performance risk includes an assessment of the likelihood of cost overruns and claims, risks to quality, timeliness, and additional expense of contract administration if award is made to the offeror. Performance risk evaluations may take into account the personal experience of the evaluators or other Government personnel.
3. Procedure:
 - a. FAR 15.801 definitions:
 - (1) Cost Analysis.
 - (2) Cost Realism.
 - (3) Information Other Than Cost or Pricing Data.
 - (4) Price.
 - (5) Price Analysis.
 - b. DFARS Definition: Cost Realism Analysis.
 - c. FAR 15.805, Proposal Analysis:

(1) FAR 15.805-1, General.

(2) FAR 15.805-2, Price Analysis.

(3) FAR 15.805-3, Cost Analysis.

d. DFARS 215.805-70, Cost Realism Analysis.

e. Source Selection Requirements/Procedures.

f. RFP Criteria.

g. "Overall Reasonableness" Cost Evaluation Sheet.

h. "Cost Realism" Cost Evaluation Sheet.

i. "Completeness" Cost Evaluation Sheet.

j. Cost evaluators shall conduct independent cost and price analysis IAW regulations, Source Selection Plan, and RFP criteria. Individual evaluations require narrative documentation of analysis. Any adjustment as a result of cost realism analysis must be explained. Cost realism adjustments made to proposed prices are for evaluation purposes only. Documentation of each evaluated element is required.

k. Evaluators will meet after documentation of individual evaluation results to reach a consensus on each evaluated proposal. The consensus will be fully documented in the report of the Cost Evaluation Team, including rationale and reasons therefor and suggested discussion questions, if appropriate. The report shall be furnished to the Contracting Officer.

l. Evaluators will assist in discussions with proposers if a competitive range is established.

m. Cost/Price Evaluation of Best and Final Offers (BAFOs) will be conducted in the same manner as initial evaluations. Final report will be prepared and furnished to the Contracting Officer.

4. Cost Evaluation Team Members:

[LIST]

Contracting Officer

MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS CHECKLIST
(FROM RFP)

YES	NO	
—	—	1. Complete Proposal Schedule.
—	—	2. Cost Breakdown of each payment item of the proposal schedule in the format provided by Exhibit 1, Cost Breakdown.
—	—	3. Proposed Cost/Scheduling System (reference 52.242-7005 Cost/Schedule Status Report (Dec 91)).

COST EVALUATION SHEET

RFP No. _____

PROPOSER: _____

EVALUATOR: _____

OVERALL REASONABLENESS (Narrative Justification):

COST EVALUATION SHEET

RFP No. _____

PROPOSER: _____

EVALUATOR: _____

COST REALISM:

a. Narrative Justification:

b. Adjustment for Evaluation Purposes:

COST EVALUATION SHEET

RFP No. _____

PROPOSER: _____

EVALUATOR: _____

COMPLETENESS (Narrative Justification):

ADDITIONAL SOURCE SELECTION PROCEDURES FOR COST/PRICE EVALUATIONS

1. In cost/price evaluation, the proposer's cost/price is compared to the Government Estimate, other proposers, the RFP requirements and cost evaluation elements, and ultimately, the proposer's technical proposal to assess overall reasonableness, realism, completeness, performance risk, and affordability of the proposed price.
2. Proposer's price/cost proposals shall not be made available to technical evaluators during the in-depth technical evaluation periods, initial and subsequent. The price or cost evaluators may and if appropriate, should, discuss the details of the technical proposals with the technical evaluators to aid in their evaluation of costs associated with the statement of work.
3. In addition to cost/price analysis, further measurement of cost or price reasonableness shall be made. This can be accomplished by comparing Government cost estimates with proposed costs/prices after considering the risk associated with the technical approach and disposition of deficiencies.
4. Applicable agency acquisition regulations prohibit numerical scoring of cost proposals. It is recognized that evaluation of cost may be somewhat judgmental. Fully document the rationale for accepting variances from the Government Estimate as reasonable and/or realistic.
5. Overall reasonableness and cost realism are defined in the FAR. Cost realism should be evaluated for each major cost element, as well as overall. Adjustments (upward or downward) shall be made if warranted, and explained in narrative format. **COST REALISM ADJUSTMENTS ARE FOR EVALUATION PURPOSES ONLY.** Completeness should be determined by comparing the data required or requested with the data actually submitted with a proposal. If a cost proposal is complete and accurate, following the initial evaluations, cost proposals should be compared with the Government Estimate and with other cost proposals to determine reasonableness and competitiveness. Performance risk analysis should be performed for each cost proposal.

SAMPLE: ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS IN SOURCE SELECTION

1. The proposal evaluation criteria and evaluation records must be adequate to demonstrate to the selecting official (or even to independent parties) a clear distinction and basis for offeror scoring, e.g., concise basis for scoring #1 superior to #2, etc.
2. The primary consideration should be which offeror can perform the contract in a manner most advantageous to the Government.
3. The Source Selection Evaluation Board (SSEB) should meet to:
 - Review Acquisition Plan
 - Review project information for familiarization
 - Prepare the schedule of actions
4. A checklist for conformance with RFP requirements should be prepared.
5. The SSEB shall provide to the selecting official:
 - Summary of proposal evaluation process
 - List of all firms who furnished a proposal
 - Complete evaluation records in support of the scoring
6. Unless requested in writing by the SSA, the SSEB should not recommend the selection of a contractor, but will report its findings and conclusions to the SSA.
7. SSEB members should be briefed on the sensitivity of the selection process, the prohibition against unauthorized disclosure of information, and the requirements pertaining to conflict of interest (Procurement Integrity Act requirements).
8. Inform all prospective offerors that the Government may solicit, from available sources, relevant information concerning the offeror's record of past performance.
9. Contacts with offerors and the private sector should be handled by one member of the committee, normally the contracting officer, or the contracting officer's designee.
10. Procedures should be established for the secure handling of proposals, worksheets, records of meetings, reports, and other documentation.
11. The SSEB should arrive at a common understanding and application of the scoring definitions, numerical scales and adjectives in terms of strengths and weaknesses.

12. Method for evaluating cost proposals must be in accordance with applicable Federal Acquisition Regulations.
13. Initial phase of evaluation is a review to determine whether or not each proposal meets the minimum criteria specified in the RFP.
14. The SSEB should arrive at a common understanding of the major strengths and weaknesses and the potential correctability of each proposer's weaknesses. Scoring will be accomplished by a general consensus of the committee.
15. Pre-award surveys, performance evaluations, facility capability reports, procurement system reviews, and audit reports which bear on an offeror's performance and capabilities may be available from other Government offices.

SAMPLE: TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEETS

A. SAMPLE TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET (TEW) NO. 1

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

OFFEROR'S NAME: _____

Team Member: _____ Date: _____

TECHNICALLY ACCEPTABLE:

In order to be technically acceptable, an offeror's initial proposal must contain the following items. If any one or more of the items is not present, no further scoring or evaluation is required, and the proposal must be rejected.

	Yes	No
Construction Schedule	—	—
General Description of Work	—	—
Organizational Chart	—	—
Evidence of Experience	—	—

Remarks: This proposal is technically *acceptable* / *unacceptable* (circle one, cross out the other).

FACTOR 1: PRICE. Analysis Performed Separately.

FACTOR 2: EXPERIENCE.

Definition: Proposer shall demonstrate his relative depth and breadth of experience in the technical execution of work experiences similar to that included in this solicitation. Direct experience of the offeror, any joint venture partners or offerors related by some form of ownership agreement will be considered more than experience of any subcontractors. The following information should be provided:

TEW No. 1 (continued)

(1) Documentation reflecting the offeror has completed similar general construction projects in accordance with U.S. standards or Corps of Engineers (CE) standards.

Remarks: _____

(2) Documentation reflecting the offeror has completed similar general construction projects in the Middle East especially in the Host Nation per U.S. standards or CE standards.

Remarks: _____

(3) Documentation reflecting the offeror has completed similar construction projects (metal air-conditioned warehouse construction and pre-cast concrete work).

Remarks: _____

(4) Documentation reflecting the offeror's experience and knowledge of procurement and delivery issues, and related time durations, including shipping and customs clearance procedures similar to those involved in this project.

Remarks: _____

TEW No. 1 (continued)

FACTOR 3: MANAGEMENT AND EXECUTION PLAN.

Definition: Offeror's management and execution plan should include all the elements specified in the RFP and show that milestones and completion terms identified conform to the RFP requirements. The plan should demonstrate soundness and reasonableness of the execution approach, and should demonstrate that the offeror has an understanding of the scope of work for the project. The following items must be provided:

Project Schedule

(1) The overall project schedule should identify all major elements of procurement, delivery, and construction.

Remarks: _____

(2) The schedule should show as a minimum the basic elements of mobilization, general equipment and materials procurement, long lead-time equipment procurements, delivery durations, intended phasing of the construction, construction durations by phase, and finish work by facility.

Remarks: _____

(3) Activity durations should also be included for inspection and acceptance of completed facilities and demobilization. The estimated completion date for completed facilities or construction phases should be clearly indicated.

Remarks: _____

TEW No. 1 (continued)

General Description of the Work

(4) Description and estimated percentage of work to be performed as prime contractor.
(REQUIRED)

Remarks: _____

(5) Description of work to be subcontracted. (REQUIRED)

Remarks: _____

(6) Estimated total number of employees plotted against time for the duration of the project. (REQUIRED)

Remarks: _____

(7) Organization and staffing chart. (REQUIRED)

Remarks: _____

TEW No. 1 (continued)

FACTOR 4: PAST PERFORMANCE.

Definition: The offeror should provide evidence and documentation which demonstrates customer satisfaction, delivery of quality work, timeliness, integrity, cooperative effort, and commitment to customer satisfaction. Documentation should include awards, letters of commendation, etc. The following information should be provided:

Note to evaluator: *Lack of any available (because non-existent) past performance information cannot result in the proposal being downgraded. For offerors with no past performance, do not score this item, and do not use past performance as an element of overall individual or consensus rating (see summary sheet). However, evidence of poor past performance can be used to downgrade a proposal, resulting in a lower score for this evaluation factor; evidence of favorable and above average past performance can be used to increase the score of a proposal on this element, resulting in a higher score for this evaluation factor.*

- 1) Awards, letters of commendation, etc.

Remarks: _____

TEW No. 1 (continued)

**TECHNICAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET
(REFER TO RFP AND SSP FOR ADDITIONAL GUIDELINES)**

OFFEROR'S NAME: _____

Evaluator: _____ Date: _____

FACTOR 1: PRICE. Rating Performed Separately

FACTOR 2: EXPERIENCE (50 maximum points):

Rating System:	Outstanding	26 - 50 points
	Satisfactory	11 - 25 points
	Below Average	0 - 10 points

Note: *Point spread may vary depending on goals of each acquisition.*

Definition: Proposer shall demonstrate its relative depth and breadth of experience in the technical execution of work experiences similar to that included in this solicitation. Direct experience of the offeror, any joint venture partners or any offerors related by some form of ownership agreement will be considered more than experience of any subcontractors.

Score: _____

Evaluation Remarks: (Strengths, weaknesses, risks, and justification for numerical and adjectival rating in light of scoring definitions.)

TEW No. 1 (continued)

FACTOR 3: MANAGEMENT AND EXECUTION PLAN (45 maximum points):

Rating System:	Outstanding	23 - 45 points
	Satisfactory	11 - 22 points
	Below Average	0 - 10 points

Definition: Offeror's management and execution plan should include all the elements specified in the RFP and milestones and completion terms identified should conform to the RFP requirements. The plan should demonstrate soundness and reasonableness of the execution approach, and should demonstrate that the offeror has an understanding of the scope of work.

Score: _____

Evaluation Remarks: (Strengths, weaknesses, risks, and justification for numerical and adjectival rating in light of scoring definitions.)

FACTOR 4: PAST PERFORMANCE (40 maximum points):

Rating System:	Outstanding	21 - 40 points
	Satisfactory	10 - 20 points
	Below Average	0 - 9 points

Note to evaluator: *Lack of any available past performance information (because it is nonexistent) cannot result in the proposal being downgraded. For offerors with no past performance, do not score this item, and do not use past performance as an element of overall individual or consensus rating. However, evidence of poor past performance can be used to downgrade a proposal, resulting in a lower score for this evaluation factor; and evidence of favorable and above average past performance can be used to increase the score of a proposal on this element, resulting in a higher score for this evaluation factor.*

Definition: The offeror should provide evidence and documentation which demonstrates

TEW No. 1 (continued)

customer satisfaction, delivery of quality work, timeliness, integrity, cooperative effort, and commitment to customer satisfaction. Documentation should include awards, letters of commendation, etc. Information may be obtained from any source listed in the RFP.

Score: _____

Evaluation Remarks: (Strengths, weaknesses, risks, and justification for numerical and adjectival rating in light of scoring definitions.)

TEW No. 1 (continued)

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Technical Analysis Definitions

1. The following are the scoring adjectives and definitions which will be used by the Technical Evaluation Team.

a. **Outstanding.** To receive an **outstanding** rating, all of the following criteria must be satisfied:

(1) The offeror exceeds the minimum requirements stated in the solicitation for the element being evaluated.

(2) All suggested information under "experience," "management and execution plan," or "past performance" has been provided.

(3) The offeror shall have fully demonstrated his ability to perform this element. The information presented leaves no doubt as to the capabilities, experience, and resources of the offeror.

(4) The offeror shall have demonstrated that he fully understands the scope of the project. The information presented leaves no doubt that the offeror understands the scope or work and the necessary milestones to be accomplished.

(5) The past performance of the offeror is well documented demonstrating customer satisfaction, quality work and on time delivery, cooperative effort, and integrity. None of the sources consulted in the past performance evaluation suggests unfavorable performance. (Note: If the offeror has no past performance information available, give a "neutral" score - i.e., do not rate.)

(6) Performance risk (risk to successful performance of the contract) is low or nonexistent.

b. **Satisfactory:** To receive a rating of **satisfactory or average**, all of the following criteria must be satisfied:

(1) The offeror shall satisfy the minimum requirements stated in the solicitation for the element being evaluated.

TEW No. 1 (continued)

(2) Under "experience" the offeror has omitted no more than one of the five suggested items. Under "management and execution plan" the offeror has omitted no more than two of the seven suggested items.

(3) The offeror shall have demonstrated that he can reasonably be expected to perform this element. No major suggested item has been omitted which would indicate a lack of capability to satisfactorily accomplish the project.

(4) The offeror shall have demonstrated that he generally understands the scope of the project. No major suggested item has been omitted which would indicate a lack of understanding of the scope of the project. The information presented demonstrates that the offeror understands the scope of work and the necessary milestones to satisfactorily accomplish the work.

(5) The offeror has provided documentation of satisfactory past performance, and there is no indication of unfavorable past performance from sources used in evaluating this element. (Note: If the offeror has no available past performance information, give a "neutral" rating - i.e., do not rate.)

(6) Performance risk is moderate.

c. **Below Average:** To receive a rating of **below average**, all of the following criteria must be satisfied:

(1) The offeror shall satisfy the minimum requirements stated in the solicitation of the element being evaluated.

(2) Under "experience" the offeror has omitted more than one of the five suggested items. Under "management and execution plan" the offeror has omitted more than two of the seven suggested items.

(3) The offeror has not demonstrated either by experience or the management and execution plan that he can reasonably be expected to perform this element. Major items have been omitted which would indicate a lack of capability to satisfactorily accomplish the project.

(4) The offeror has not demonstrated a general understanding of the scope of the project or the major milestones necessary to satisfactorily accomplish the project. Major suggested items have been omitted which would indicate a lack of understanding of the scope of the project.

TEW No. 1 (continued)

(5) The past performance information of the offeror reasonably indicates problems in past performance in terms of the evaluation criteria. (Note: If the proposer has no available past performance information, give a "neutral" rating - i.e., do not rate.)

(6) Performance risk is high.

d. Technically Unacceptable. To receive a rating of **Technically Unacceptable**:

(1) The offeror has failed to satisfy the minimum requirements for proposal submission, or has completely omitted or misunderstood RFP requirements, indicating the offeror's lack of understanding of the RFP requirements or the scope of work; or

(2) The proposal cannot meet RFP requirements without revisions essentially involving a rewrite of the proposal, or cannot meet the RFP requirements at all.